

REMARKS

Claims 1-11, 14-23, 25-28 and 30-35 are pending. Claims 1, 25, 30 and 33 have been amended. New claims 34-35 have been added. In light of the following, all of the claims are now in condition for allowance.

If, after considering this response, the Examiner does not agree that all of the claims are allowable, he is requested to schedule a teleconference with the Applicant's attorney to further the prosecution of the application.

Rejection of claims 5, 17-23, 26-28 and 31 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement

The Examiner claims that there is no disclosure of a configuration having three conductive regions that are electrically coupled by a plurality of unequally spaced bridging conductors. The Examiner correctly concedes that FIG. 2A and the corresponding disclosure discloses two conductive regions that are electrically coupled by a plurality of unequally spaced bridging conductors. However, FIG. 3 and the corresponding disclosure, including paragraphs 32 and 34, specifically state that "as with the PCB 50, optional bridging conductors may be formed across the openings 122 and 124" (paragraph 32). In other words, "the PCB 100 may include one or more bridging conductors across the openings 122 and 124" (paragraph 34). As a result, the written description requirement is satisfied.

Rejection of Claims 1, 3-6, 10-11, 14-16, 30 and 32-33 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Wiggernhorn (US 3,961,296) in view of Trinh (US 5,125,111)

Claim 1

Claim 1, as amended, recites a plurality of unequally spaced bridging portions of a conductive plane that electrically couple the conductive plane across an opening.

For example, referring, e.g., to FIG. 2A and paragraphs 27-29 of the present application, "at least one" bridging portion 64 "may be formed when otherwise vacating the conductive plane 60 to form the continuous opening 62" (paragraph 27). As a result, the bridging portions 64 are actually a portion of, and planar to, the conductive plane 60. In addition, the spacing between the bridging portions 64 may be "unequal" (paragraph 29).

Wiggenhorn, on the other hand, does not disclose or teach a plurality of unequally spaced bridging portions of a conductive plane that electrically couple the conductive plane across an opening. In fact, this is conceded by the Examiner in the Office Action. The Examiner further concedes that Wiggenhorn also does not teach only one bridging portion of the conductive plane.

Similarly, Trinh et al. does not disclose or teach a plurality of unequally spaced bridging portions of a conductive plane that electrically couple the conductive plane across an opening. Trinh et al., at, e.g., FIG. 2 and col. 8, lines 50-55, simply discloses gold ribbons, bond wires or air bridges 52 that span over the center feed lines of the waveguides 30 and 32. However, these bond wires 52 are not portions of the conducting plane itself. In fact, by definition, the bond wires 52 cannot be portions of the conducting plane because they must rise over an underlying center feed line that is planar to the conducting plane. As a result, it follows that the bond wires 52 also cannot be planar to the conducting plane. Therefore, modifying the teachings of Wiggenhorn by incorporating the teachings of Trinh et al. would not satisfy the limitations of claim 1.

Claims 30 and 33

Claims 30 and 33, as amended, are patentable for reasons similar to those discussed above in support of claim 1.

Claims 3-6, 10-11, 14-16 and 32

Claims 3-6, 10-11, 14-16 and 32 are patentable by virtue of their dependency from independent claim 1.

Rejection of Claim 2 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Wiggenhorn and Trinh, and further in view of Wright et al. (US 6,624,729)

Claim 2 is patentable by virtue of its dependency from independent claim 1.

Rejection of Claims 7-9 and 25 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Wiggenhorn and Trinh, and further in view of Applicant's FIG. 1

Claim 25

Claim 25, as amended, is patentable for reasons similar to those discussed above in support of claim 1.

Claims 7-9

Claims 7-9 are patentable by virtue of their dependency from independent claim

1.

CONCLUSION

In light of the foregoing, all pending claims are in condition for allowance, which is respectfully requested.

If, after considering this response, the Examiner does not agree that all of the claims are allowable, then it is respectfully requested that the Examiner contact the Applicant's attorney, Paul Rusyn, at (425) 455-5575.

In the event additional fees are due as a result of this amendment, you are hereby authorized to charge such amount to Deposit Account No. 08-2025.

DATED this 11th day of October, 2005.

Respectfully Submitted,
GRAYBEAL JACKSON/HALEY LLP



Paul F. Rusyn
Attorney for Applicant
Registration No. 42,118
155 – 108th Ave. NE, Suite 350
Bellevue, WA 98004-5973
(425) 455-5575